

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 475

SO 016 191

AUTHOR Boulding, Elise  
TITLE The Participation of Sociologists in the Nuclear Debate.  
PUB DATE Aug 84  
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (San Antonio, TX, August 1984).  
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Activism; \*Global Approach; Interdisciplinary Approach; Literature Reviews; \*Nuclear Warfare; Science History; \*Social Attitudes; Social Change; \*Sociology; World Problems

## ABSTRACT

Sociologists have much to contribute to the nuclear debate, yet they have remained largely unorganized and hesitant about their potential contribution to this crucial issue. While physical scientists and social scientists from other disciplines have developed numerous organizations to address the threat of war, especially nuclear war, since the 1930's, sociologists who want to work in this area have had to do so through interdisciplinary organizations. This situation calls for sociologists to return to global analysis rather than continuing their recent emphasis on microsociology. Such subdisciplines as military sociology have not dealt with strategy issues, while the area of conflict studies has held a somewhat marginal position within the discipline. Yet, even within the narrow focus most frequently employed by sociologists, enough research has been done (e.g., in such areas as understanding how sovereign states maintain peace while pursuing their own interests) that sociologists can make contributions now. Some areas in which sociologists could make a significant impact include understanding the world military system, war symbolism in our culture, and the sociological dimensions of nuclear winter, as well as envisioning ways of designing a peaceful future. (IS)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED253475

DRAFT COPY

THE PARTICIPATION OF SOCIOLOGISTS IN THE NUCLEAR DEBATE  
NOTES FOR ASA SESSION ON SOCIOLOGISTS AND THE  
NUCLEAR DEBATE, AUGUST, 1984, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Elise Boulding, Dartmouth College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

\* This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.  
Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Elise Boulding*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

It is a temptation to say that this could be a one-sentence paper:  
sociologists have had no role in the nuclear debate. It would not be  
true, but it is near enough to the truth to give a special poignancy  
to this session for a person like myself who has been involved in war-  
peace issues for over forty years, and found little support for that  
involvement in my chosen profession. In those forty years the public  
has witnessed the mobilization of group after group of scientists and  
professionals to research the problems which atomic weaponry presented  
to the world, to explore alternative ways of dealing with the issues  
that gave rise to the weaponry, and to educate the public about their  
findings so that an informed citizenry could support policies which  
would avoid a nuclear holocaust. Sociologists have been almost invisible  
among these groups.

The physicists were the first to organize. The Bulletin of Atomic  
Scientists, the research-education-action tool of the physicists, began  
publication in 1945. Yet some social scientists had anticipated the  
coming crises back in the thirties. A new interdepartmental program  
developed at the University of Chicago for the study of peace and war  
under the leadership of Quincy Wright. Shortly before World War II,  
the Committee on the Psychology of Peace and War of the Society for the

5d 016191

Psychological Study of Social Issues had prepared a Yearbook on the Psychology of Peace and War (which, in fact, the Association did not permit them to publish until after the war). The anthropologists had a war-peace network in which Margaret Mead was active. In 1935 the first bill for a National Peace Academy went before Congress. By 1942 the Council on Foreign Relations had launched a major national program in War and Peace Studies. The uneasiness about the institution of war which pervaded the thirties had really begun at the turn of the century; the Hague Peace Conferences were convened in a mood of rejection of war as a means of international dispute settlement.

What little optimism there had been among social scientists in the thirties about the possibility of controlling war turned to pessimism in the late forties as the cold war evolved. For some reason, the cold war affected social scientists' thinking more than the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The implications of atomic weaponry did not become clear until much later. By the early fifties a new generation of social scientists joined the older generation in a series of mobilizations of scientific effort which were precursors to the mobilizations we have seen since 1980. It should be recorded that Robert Cooley Angell was one of the first voices to be heard in the fifties. His presidential address in 1951 on Sociology and World Crisis (Angell, 1951) laid out an agenda for avoiding a prolonged cold war and an increasingly likely global war which included research, education and action. The following year the interdisciplinary Research Exchange for the Prevention of War was founded, to be followed in 1959 by the interdisciplinary Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan, of which Angell was a co-founder.

What was happening in the fifties was that individuals from each of the social science disciplines were reaching out to their colleagues in other disciplines, because it was so clear that the problems of war could not be dealt with within one discipline only. But while the psychologists, political scientists and anthropologists had special committees on peace and war within their own professional associations, the sociologists had only the interdisciplinary contact to turn to for professional support.<sup>1</sup> In 1955 the U.S. monopoly on nuclear weapons was broken by the Soviet Union, and the sense of urgency about nuclear military technology among scientists was irrevocably awakened. The physical scientists were the first to have an international professional group to deal with nuclear weaponry - Pugwash, formed in 1957. The social scientists' professional association, the International Peace Research Association, was not officially formed until 1965.

The arms race had now turned clearly into a nuclear arms race, and there was a feverish press to set research agendas for the social sciences on how to avoid war. In 1959 the Institute of International Order commissioned a series of five reports which were to comprise a comprehensive scheme of research bearing on the problems of world conflict and world order, for the use of the American intellectual community. A research agenda for the next decade was laid out in the fields of arms control, decision-making in national and international political processes, attitude formation and communication processes, economic factors, and international law.<sup>2</sup> No sociologist was commissioned to participate in the preparation of these reports, although Irvin Louis Horowitz had just published his major study, War and Peace in Contemporary Social and Philosophical Theory in 1957, and C. Wright Mills' The Causes of World

War III had come out in the same year. (In France, Aron's (1958) first book on atomic weapons and diplomacy also appeared.) Sociologists seemed to lack institutional visibility on war-peace subjects. The Institute for International Order project had some impact on the nascent policy studies field, and resulted in a quarterly, later semiannual, digest of articles, books, unpublished materials, and research in progress entitled Current Thought on Peace and War. This was published for some years by Larry Leonard, then with the Institute of International Order (now the World Policy Institute) for the use of the social science community. A search through this now discontinued periodical will reveal sociologists' work being reported, but rarely featured.

By 1960 the Soviet Union had a nuclear stockpile and the means of delivery of nuclear warheads, and the social science community responded with stepped-up activity. This time some sociologists responded directly to the nuclear issue: Etzioni wrote an outraged "Our First Manual of Nuclear War" in 1961, followed by the more strategically oriented apologia for defense policy, The Hard Way to Peace (1962). Dentler and Cutright produced Hostage America: Human Aspects of a Nuclear Attack and a Program of Prevention (1963) and from France came Raymond Aron's The Great Debate: Theories of Nuclear Strategy (1965), again, more strategically oriented. Among the most policy impacting books to come out of social science at this time were probably economist Kenneth Boulding's Conflict and Defense, defining the system change in national defense brought by nuclear weapons, and psychologist Charles Osgood's Alternative to War or Surrender (1962), a theory of graduated reciprocated tension reduction which has served as a counterpoint to deterrence theory discussions ever since.

This was a high-activity period on nuclear issues in the U.S. A new peace movement had arisen in response to the threat of nuclear testing,

and for the first time in decades the women's peace movement and the student peace movement had major public visibility. Responsive to public concern, the Kennedy administration created: (1) the Peace Corps, (2) a short-lived Peace Research Institute under Ambassador Wadsworth, to be semi-governmental and semi-private, and finally the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This was a high-activity period for scientists, too. The predecessor of the Union of Concerned Scientists formed, and helped test the baby teeth sent in by worried mothers, for levels of strontium 90. Physicians for Social Responsibility was organized (and had a second birth toward the end of the next decade). The 1960 Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association devoted a series of sessions to Psychology and Policy in a Nuclear Age, published in a special issue of the Journal of Social Issues (1961). A series of international arms control symposia were held at the University of Michigan which heightened the intensity of the interdisciplinary dialogue on control of nuclear weapons. The Michigan Center for Research on Conflict Resolution, which included Robert Angell and Morris Janowitz, was serving as a focal point for an international group of social scientists concerned to use their professional skills to contribute to the increasingly difficult problems of arms control and peace development, eventuating in the formation of the previously mentioned International Peace Research Association in London in 1965. In 1963 social psychologist Robert Lifton returned from a research tour of Japan and electrified students, the research community, and the general public with his speaking and writing on the survivors of Hiroshima (1967). His words put radiation-decayed flesh and blood on

the bones of everyone's fears of nuclear war. SOS, Scientists on Survival, was formed by a group of physical and social scientists to alert the general public to the need for weapons control.

The increasingly unpopular war in Vietnam shadowed and complicated the debate on nuclear policy. The ever-vigilant psychologists were applying social perception theories to explain policy misjudgements both in Vietnam (White 1966) and in Soviet-American relations (Bronfenbrenner 1961). As the gap between perception and reality appeared to widen, fears that nuclear weapons might be used in Vietnam increased the desire of social scientists to inject some knowledge of human behavior into policy making. The loss in 1965 of clear nuclear superiority of the U.S. over the Soviet Union gave the arms race another spurt, adding further fuel to the motivational fires of science. In Europe, the government of Sweden responded by establishing the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) as an autonomous international institute. By 1969 the annual SIPRI Yearbooks on the state of the world military establishment, an invaluable data source for scholars, began coming out.

With the cumulative data bases made available through the SIPRI Yearbooks, the events data research movement (Azar 1975), the use of the mirror-image concept to explain U.S.-Soviet relations (Angell 196\_) and the advent of game theory as a policy tool (Bernard 1961), this would appear to have been a promising time for the flowering of sociological research on nuclear issues. What emerged instead was a flowering of military sociology, and the development of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society at the University of Chicago. Under the intellectual leadership of Morris Janowitz and a growing group of colleagues nationally and internationally, it has performed a distinctive

function in researching the sociology of military institutions, but as Janowitz (1971) himself has said, it has not entered the nuclear policy issue. Apart from military sociology, the discipline was not in the public eye. When the Senate-House 2-day conference on The Military Budget and National Priorities was held in 1969 which produced the widely read book American Militarism (Knoll and McFadden 1969), there were political scientists, economists, international lawyers and physical scientists, but no sociologists present. When Philip Green edited one of the first major interdisciplinary studies on nuclear deterrence in 1966, the sociological contribution to the volume was a chapter on social methodology from Gross (1959). The group of graduate students who gathered under the aegis of the Institute of Policy Studies in 1969 to examine policies by which the defense establishment operated and who published The Pentagon Watchers (Rodberg and Shearer 1970), had no sociologists in their otherwise broadly interdisciplinary group.

The 1970s brought the end of the Vietnam war, steady escalation of the arms race, and another round of mobilizations of the scientific community. In 1970 a North American branch of the International Peace Research Association, the Consortium for Peace Research, Education and Development, gave a home to a number of sociologists as well as other social scientists who were interested in developing alternative security strategies and nonviolent conflict resolution scenarios for international conflict. The following year the prestigious American Association for the Advancement of Science acknowledged security policy as a national problem by holding sessions on "Value and Knowledge Requirements for Peace." Although sociologists participated, they gave presentations only

on domestic conflict. The AAAS has since created a committee on Arms Control and National Security which includes a sociologist in its membership. In this decade many professional associations created committees on arms control, security, and peace. Psychologists, psychiatrists, historians, international lawyers, and political scientists already had their committees. The mathematicians, geographers, anthropologists, philosophers, international studies people, and sociologists joined them. The ASA appointed a Committee on the Sociology of World Conflicts in 1972 and approved a Section in 1976.<sup>3</sup>

I have described successive mobilizations of professionals in the forties, fifties, sixties and seventies. Although the salient military policy issues differed in each decade, the basic ground for mobilization was a perception on the part of more and more scientists, from both the physical and the social disciplines, that science was being misused for weapons research, and not being well used in the making of foreign policy. Over the decades social scientists divided somewhat over whether their knowledge should be applied to a more effective and sparing use of military technology (arms control) or whether their behavioral knowledge could offer strategies that would provide diplomatic solutions to diplomatic problems. As military technology has become more complex and more socially absorbing, it has become harder to establish policy debates on other than military technology grounds. By the late 1970s the character of the mobilization of the scientific community changed somewhat. The special committees and sections of professional associations continued, but the emphasis was now more on forming new special-purpose "social responsibility" organizations outside the professional associations on the model of the Physicians for Social Responsibility, and on forming

coalitions among organizations for the purpose of lobbying in Washington or outreach to college campuses and the community. The nuclear freeze coalition, which is primarily community-based, actually includes many members of scientific and professional organizations in its constituency.

These newly mobilized coalitions, including the nuclear freeze coalition itself, have a particular problem in discussing policy alternatives without becoming bogged down in examination of the features of respective weapons systems. Instead of being able to question deterrence policy itself, most groups find themselves pushed to decide which weapons systems will be the most effective, least dangerous deterrent.

Each new group is finding its own answer to this difficult problem. The newly revived Physicians for Social Responsibility has moved from emphasis on the need for war avoidance because of the impossibility of meaningful survival from nuclear war to creating a professionals' coalition for nuclear arms control with the Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control and the Union of Concerned Scientists. The emphasis is on public education, some policy research, and much lobbying. Both the psychiatrists and the psychologists have formed additional groups to work specifically on the threat of nuclear war. Teachers and social workers have also formed Social Responsibility Associations to deal professionally with the threat of nuclear war as it affects their clienteles. During the second special session on Disarmament at the U.N. in 1978 a group of sociologists and other social scientists assembled to form Social Scientists Against Nuclear War. Their main work so far has been developing bibliographies for teachers on college campuses.

The threat of nuclear war is now the overwhelming theme. The astrophysicists, meteorologists, geographers and biologists who are collaborating on studies of the nuclear winter under the aegis of the International Council of Scientific Unions have taken on the mantle of the physicians in showing the impossibility of survival after nuclear war. The geographers, who provide a unique interface between the physical and the social scientists, are among the most active of professional groups organized around nuclear issues. They have formed an association of Socially and Ecologically Responsible Geographers and a quarterly journal, *Transition*, which has been going for 14 years. In a recent issue Gilbert White (1984) suggests to his fellow geographers research and action projects to educate local communities on the social and environmental effects of nuclear war. The 32-page journal is full of research, education and action reports. This association represents an interesting professional model based squarely on scientific expertise with equally strong research and action components which few other professional groups have replicated.

Foundations have discovered the saliency of the threat of nuclear war theme, and the Council on Foundations now hosts regular meetings of about 40 foundations which wish to fund "threat of war" activities. Because there is no larger frame of reference for these activities, and usually no policy goal beyond obtaining a nuclear weapons freeze, the intensity of commitment to activity is in contrast to its fragmented, incoherent nature. The situation cries out for sociologists to take a more active role in conceptualizing the larger picture of international order trapped in its own weaponry, and in identifying institutions, relationships, and processes which can lead out of the trap. This brings

me back to the sociological profession, which this paper is supposed to be about. Is there any basis in the developmental course of our profession for thinking that sociologists could play such a role now? If there is, why haven't they done so sooner? These are the questions we will now address.

### The Story of Sociology and the Nuclear Debate

In the 1940s, the classical tradition of macrosociology was still being practiced. The impact of two world wars in rapid succession led to an awareness that the international order was changing. The evolutionary optimists were sure that the changes would be for the good, but others weren't so sure. It is interesting that it was in the American Journal of Sociology that Harold Lasswell published his classic "The Garrison State," suggesting "the possibility that we are moving toward a world of 'garrison states' - a world in which the specialists on violence are the most powerful groups in Society" (Lasswell 1941:455).<sup>4</sup> This was C. Wright Mills' fear - that we were moving toward a permanent war economy in the twentieth century (Mills 1956). Riesman ( ), in a different vein, was also concerned with macrosocial trends poorly understood in the present. But George Lundberg in his presidential address to the ASA in 1944 on Sociologists and the Peace was more optimistic. In the challenge to reshape society faced by the U.S., he said, the knowledge sociologists have is what is needed for peace, as the knowledge the physical scientists had was needed for war (Lundberg 1944). Sorokin's "Conditions and Prospects for a World Without War" (1944) shares Lundberg's sober optimism.

The sense that sociologists had the tools available for constructing a peaceful and good social order in the midst of rapid change is similarly reflected in the writing of Hornell Hart about the acceleration thesis (Hart 1945, 1947). Utilizing Ogburn's concept of cultural lag, he predicts that the hitherto widening gap between technology, including the technology of the atomic bomb, and the social and psychological knowledge needed to produce a satisfactory social order, will now narrow and disappear because of an enormous acceleration in social research. He provides a specific research agenda for his fellow sociologists in order to bring this about.<sup>5</sup> In a similarly optimistic vein, Helmut Callis (1947) lays out a research agenda for a sociology of international relations, pointing out the need for whole interrelated system studies on a global scale - once the dynamics of how nation states handle their problems have been clarified. He sees these world system studies as contributing to the emergence of a new peaceful world culture in which science will be reintegrated with ethics.

The optimism of Lundberg, Hart, and Callis is gone by the 1950s. Robert Angell's presidential address, "Sociology and World Crisis" (1951) is an urgent call to sociologists to help avoid prolonged cold war or global war by studying the "tentative processes" (Cooley's concept) by which new structures, relationships, and norms emerge in the larger context of developing a theory of the world social system. The research agenda on the study of these tentative processes which he lays out is one which, to his credit and our benefit, he followed faithfully and productively himself all his life.

The concept of a world social system, which appears in the work of Sorokin (1937-41, 1944, 1965) and Gurvitch (1959), requires taking a

long view of history as well as a large-scale approach to the present. The last clarion calls to this type of research come in the presidential addresses, respectively, of Sorokin in 1965 ("The Sociology of Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow") and Wilbert Moore in 1966 ("The Utility of Utopias"). Sorokin sees the 60s as launching a new 40-year era of creativity focussed on macrosocial issues after a 40-year period of focussing on wars and microsocial concerns. Moore's address on utopias needs to be read together with his article on "Global Sociology: The World as a Singular System," which appeared in the American Journal of Sociology the same year. He complains in "Global Sociology" that sociologists have lost a sense of social systems at the world level. The macrosociological tradition of Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, and Weber and the study of the "Science of Society" have disappeared. The social system has become synonymous with the nation state; particularly for American sociologists, it has become synonymous with the U.S. Because global problems are global, we need to rediscover "super-systems" to understand contemporary social processes. We must study them for sheer survival, says Moore - though he is not sure we will survive to study them. In his address on utopias he points out that although humans are future and goal-oriented and have purposes both personal and social, sociology as a discipline is embarrassed by human purpose. Survival until the year 2000 may depend on an understanding of the way in which the image of the possible future determines action in the present.<sup>6</sup>

The research agendas set by Lundberg, Callis, Angell, Moore, and Sorokin in the forties and fifties, with a little spillover into the sixties, did not catch the interest of the sociological profession.

As we shall see shortly, there was periodic attention to issues of war and conflict, but analysis of these phenomena as part of a world system was to come only in the 70s, and then only to a limited degree. It was as if sociologists decided to forget about war. Texts in introductory sociology and social problems rarely mentioned war. When books were written on international issues, the reviewers generally criticized them for being "poor sociology." Macro was out, micro was in.

#### Research Agendas of Sociologists

Nevertheless, individual sociologists had their own agendas, and have written and published accordingly. There are 61 sociologists listed as first authors in the Bibliography on World Conflict and Peace (Boulding 1979). If we omit the classical authors on war and peace included in the bibliography, that makes roughly 10 percent of the authors included. That corresponds well with the 11 percent identified as sociologists of the respondents to a 1963 questionnaire sent out by the Center for Conflict Resolution to scholars known to be interested in peace research (Boulding and Boulding 1969). Two or three times that many sociologists have published in the field, but are known better for work in other fields. Of the 11 most frequent research categories used to describe the research entries in the World Conflicts Bibliography, sociologists concentrate mostly on three (see Table 1): conflict, integration, and the military organization, with some attention to mediation and attitudes, perceptions.<sup>7</sup>

The research subjects not well covered by authors generally are arms (including new weapons technologies, nuclear weapons), which ranks

TABLE 1

Rank Order Of Eleven Research Subjects Most Frequently  
Covered in World Conflict and Peace Bibliography

| Number<br>Entries | Rank<br>Order | Subject                                                       |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 208               | 1             | International Political Systems                               |
| 194               | 2             | Conflict (includes gaming, simulation, coalition formation)** |
| 163               | 3             | Warfare                                                       |
| 102               | 4             | Violence                                                      |
| 95                | 5             | Development <sup>#</sup>                                      |
| 92                | 6             | Disarmament                                                   |
| 88                | 7             | Integration**                                                 |
| 84                | 8             | Military**                                                    |
| 84                | 9             | Nonviolence                                                   |
| 83                | 10            | Mediation (includes negotiation, dispute settlement)*         |
| <u>82</u>         | 11            | Attitudes, perceptions*                                       |

1063 = TOTAL ENTRIES IN BIBLIO

\*\*Most frequently covered by sociologists.

\*Also covered by sociologists, but less frequently.

<sup>#</sup>Studies of military organization in developing countries are done primarily by military sociologists.

25th. Sociologists scarcely deal with these issues at all. Of the twenty-seven entries dealing with nuclear technology, only two are by sociologists. Of the twelve dealing with other aspects of the arms race, including detente and deterrence, none are by sociologists. (As Finsterbusch will show in his paper, there has been sociological work in this field but it was not known to the compilers of the Bibliography.) There are no sociological entries for security.

In addition to the World Conflict Bibliography, the following journals have been scanned for articles in these fields: American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology (both since the early 40s) and the Journal of Armed Forces and Society since its inception. Social Forces, Social Problems, and other special interest journals were not scanned, so the discussion refers mainly to what has appeared in the journals central to the profession and, where indicated, to the specialized military sociology journal. It is worth paying particular attention to the ASR, since it is the official journal of the ASA. A review of articles and book reviews from Volumes 25 to 42 (1960-1977, with book reviews disappearing when Contemporary Sociology, the review journal, began) nets nine articles and 42 book reviews in the war-peace field. How relevant are they to the nuclear debate? Table 2 suggests that both the articles and the books reviewed are chiefly of indirect relevance.

Again we have confirmed that there is little direct focus on nuclear issues, but attention to related issues. The fact that there are considerably more book reviews than articles in the categories indicated suggests a minimal interest in the general subject in "mainstream" sociology. This is confirmed by the entries in the World Conflicts

TABLE 2

Articles and Book Reviews Appearing in ASR, Vol. 25-42,  
Categorized by Relevance to Nuclear War Issues

| Category                                                         | Articles | Reviews of Books Written By: |                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|------------------|
|                                                                  |          | Sociologists                 | Non-sociologists |
| 1. Theory: indirectly relevant                                   | 5        | 9                            | -                |
| 2. Military sociology -<br>institutional studies                 | 0        | 9                            | -                |
| 3. Foreign policy re: nuclear war;<br>attitudes, opinions on war | 3        | 9                            | 3                |
| 4. Focus on war, but not nuclear as<br>as such; game theory      | 1        | 8                            | 2                |
| 5. Full focus on nuclear war issues                              | 0        | 3                            | 1                |
|                                                                  | <hr/>    | <hr/>                        | <hr/>            |
| TOTALS:                                                          | 9        | 38                           | 6                |

Bibliography, since most of the articles listed there by sociologists have been published outside the sociology journals, chiefly in the interdisciplinary journals concerned with war-peace issues such as Conflict Resolution, Journal of Social Issues, Journal of Peace Research, Bulletin of Peace Proposals, and from time to time, Social Problems and Social Forces. The number of books noted in Table 2 attests to a significant number of sociologists at work in the field. Two points need to be further discussed: the apparent indirect rather than direct relevance of sociologists' work to the nuclear debate, and the marginality of those sociologists to the mainstream fields.

#### The Issue of Marginality of War-Peace Research

Given the centrality of the study of global systems and macrohistorical processes when sociology first developed, and the strong appeals to sociologists in the forties and fifties to build on this tradition to deal with the pressing social problems of international conflict, why has the field been marginalized? Znaniecki (1951) suggested in the forties that the experience of seeing the hard-won achievement of sociology's recognition as an objective science lost in authoritarian and fascistic regimes in Europe traumatized sociologists to the point of retreat into a narrow empiricism. The awareness of cultural differences and minorities in the context of the interdependency fostered by the war pushed sociologists toward the study of social groups within their societies to the exclusion of attention to the larger social systems. Znaniecki warned that only through attention to the larger systems would sociologists be able to make a contribution to planning for a future world order. Archibald (1963) provided further explanations for inattention to peace issues: (1) a fear of estrangement from favored

variables and concepts, (2) a reluctance to step outside well-marked disciplinary boundaries and engage in interdisciplinary research and (3) fear of the general "messiness" (i.e., complexity) of the subject.

Probably fear of loss of objectivity is a primary concern of the profession. The fact that those social scientists who have specifically committed themselves to using their scientific training to research the structures, conditions and processes that will lead away from war and towards peace often call themselves "peace researchers" heightens the suspicion of lack of objectivity. This is a prime example of sociological embarrassment over human purposes, although it is alright to have purposes relating to the reduction of domestic social tension and the securing of civil rights. The issue is not so much that of theoretical versus applied research, since much peace research is theoretical, but of the agenda itself. For another perspective on the problem of controversial issues, see Finsterbusch (1982).

If we see these fears in the context of a continuing insecurity of status of sociology as a discipline, and note the continuing occasional confusion in Congress between sociology and socialism, we can see many reasons for the discipline to focus on more local and manageable problems.

A more difficult question than any of the above is the question of the scientist's allegiance. The fact that most scientists, including sociologists, put their knowledge at the disposal of their country in war and in preparation for war is largely taken for granted. Yet in the nuclear age it can be argued that the scientist's allegiance must be to the preservation of the planet itself. The Pugwash scientists developed a pledge in 1972:

"I will not use my scientific training for any purpose which I believe is intended to harm human beings.

I shall in my work strive for peace, justice, and the betterment of the human condition."

In 1975 the International Peace Research Association published "Scholars, Knowledge and the Public: A Pledge," prepared by North American social scientists, which attempted to spell out the moral responsibility of scientists in relation to governmental abuse of power of any kind, and particularly in relation to pursuit of war aims (International Peace Research Association Newsletter 1975).<sup>8</sup> In 1981 a sociologist, Nils Petter Gleditsch, was given a suspended sentence by the Norwegian courts for publishing research on intelligence installations in Norway, although all data used were in the public domain (Gleditsch 1982). His was the first of a number of trials of peace researchers in Europe on similar issues (Wiberg 1982). Earlier, Johan Galtung of Norway and Irving Louis Horowitz (1967) made a public issue of social science assistance to the U.S. Department of Defense in developing counterinsurgency strategies through research on resistance movements in Latin America in Project Camelot. A number of leading social scientists, including some associated with the Conflict Resolution Center at the University of Michigan, had been involved in Camelot without being aware of the issues, and the resulting debate was deeply troubling to many.<sup>9</sup> Since social scientists are eager to influence foreign policy in directions they judge to be wise (Crawford and Biderman 1969, Horowitz 1979), the issue is not being of service to governments, but the appropriate context for that service. Can sociologists meaningfully

define research in the world interest, and place national interest in the context of world interest? Given the current statist orientation of American sociology, that is a difficult question to answer. A common solution is simply to ignore it.

#### The Relevance of What Sociologists Do to Nuclear War Issues

Studies on the conflict-integration continuum have provided the major sociological contribution to the conduct of international affairs. Conflict itself is a favorite subject of sociologists. The value of confrontational conflict escalation in order to clarify issues and lay the groundwork for productive negotiated conclusions, and the understanding that many conflicts cannot be resolved, only lived with, go right back to Simmel's work, so cogently presented by Coser (1956). Whether sociologists have preferred to concentrate on the confrontational end (Dahrendorf, 1967, Kriesberg 1973, Laue 197 ) or the realm of coalition formation and bargaining and negotiation (Caplow 1968, Gamson 1982, Bartos 1974) or the integrative processes that create and strengthen social bonds and maintain what Galtung (1969) calls positive peace; (Angell 1951, Etzioni 1965, Boulding 1975, Kriesberg 1968, 1972, Evan 1962, 1984), most sociologists recognize the centrality of all these processes to the management of conflict itself in the social order. The study of violence, terrorism and genocide has of recent years occupied an increasing place in sociological research (Ben Dak 1974, Fein, 1979, Horowitz 1976, Hamilton 1980, Walters 1964, 1969). The majority of sociologists who deal with conflict are attracted to theoretical analysis which covers the whole continuum (Bernard 1965, Bruyn and

Rayman 1978, Coleman 1957, Coser 1956, Goode 1970, Goertzel 1984, Grimshaw 1969, Horowitz 1957, Kriesberg 1968, Williams 1973, Wehr 1978, Patchen 1970). The place of threat or coercive behavior on the continuum is, of course, at the confrontational end, but the use of threat and coercion is but a very small part of the range of confrontational behavior. Sociologists know this from long experience with the civil rights movement and other domestic conflicts of the past three decades in connection with social justice movements.

This knowledge poses a problem to the sociologist dealing with international conflict in the context of a national security policy based primarily on deterrence and threat of coercion. The sociologist knows that threat has a very limited use in conflict situations. Confronted with an increasingly expensive and dangerous threat technology which, because of its nature, cannot be used without destroying both parties to the conflict, the sociologist either tries to move to other types of processes on the conflict continuum (alternative nonmilitary interactions) or works to establish constraints on the use of threat (arms control) either inside or outside the military establishment. Since the sociologically interesting work, as well as the socially satisfying work, lies elsewhere on the continuum and outside that narrow threat band, only a few sociologists have been drawn to working on issues of nuclear deterrence.

The analysis of deterrence by Horowitz (1970) is a classic. By testing the deterrence theory model against the Cuban missile crisis, Horowitz is able to show that gaming led to a showdown diplomacy which abandoned traditional methods of accommodation in favor of a military definition of the situation. War was only avoided because Khrushchev

backed down in what had become a game of chicken. Horowitz concludes that gaming strategy is the science of coercion; anything which is not coercive is irrational from a strategic frame of reference. Both Horowitz and Etzioni (1961/72)<sup>10</sup> debunk the Herman Kahn mystique and make clear the tremendous risks incurred by following a nuclear deterrence strategy instead of traditional diplomatic practices. Gamson (1968), in a different vein, points out in his study of the cold war that each superpower sees itself as cautious and the other as adventurous. These analyses all show the thinness of strategic thinking in the much admired new gaming approach. From Sweden, another sociologist has provided a magnificent analysis of deterrence under the guise of disarmament negotiations. Alva Myrdal (1976) demonstrates how the defense sector of each of the superpowers is defining national security for the political sector, thus squeezing out the possibility of rational problem solving behavior. Her analysis has unfortunately not been picked up and further developed by American sociologists. Books like Tobias, et al. (1983), updating information on defense, weaponry, and military spending, while important as informational tools, do not contribute to the resolution of the dilemma of high visibility for military solutions for essentially political problems, in a situation where it is the political problems that need to be addressed.

Studies of the weapons makers have not followed on C. Wright Mills' analysis as might have been expected. Socialization into the defense industry is a related subject of no little importance. I do not know of any studies following on Shevitz' "Militarized Society and the Weapons Makers" (1970) but a doctoral dissertation is currently underway exploring the socialization of scientists into weapons research

(Crews, in process, 1984). The field of structural analysis of the inter-state system from a sociological perspective, a type of world systems analysis, has been receiving increasing attention in recent years, as for example in Barbere (1973; 1984), Finsterbusch (1973, 1974, 1975), and Hamilton (1978). Peck's analysis of nuclear weapons (1980) is an important contribution to the nuclear debate from the world system perspective. This type of analysis of the structures, mechanisms, and norms which maintain peace among sovereign states all pursuing their own national interest is very important for arms control studies, and therefore a significant contribution to the nuclear debate.

One major contribution of sociology to the nuclear debate has been the support of the Association, and of the Section on World Conflicts, for a National Peace Academy in which the social technologies of peace and conflict management processes can be addressed. Given the absence previously noted of sociologists from the debate fora of the 1970s on defense issues, it is perhaps not insignificant that two members of this Association served on the nine-person Peace Academy Commission.<sup>11</sup> The government, having developed military capability at the expense of diplomatic capability (in the broadest sense of that word) now needs the help of sociologists who have been working for years on persistent and intractable conflicts, as well as sociologists who have been working on transnational collaborative structures across the boundaries of old conflicts.

Another area in which the government needs help from sociologists is in the long drawn-out process of arms reduction and deescalation across the boundaries of old conflicts. Louis Kriesberg, in particular, has been working along these lines recently and will be making proposals

on this in his paper. This process does not require any new verification technologies (see the Verification Primer (Scribner et al. 1984)). It does, however, require knowledge of trust-inducing structures and sequences, an area in which conflict sociologists have a good deal to say. (For an early approach, see Gamson 1968.) Studies of decision making under stress are also badly needed. Sociology has dealt with decision making in several different contexts, but only infrequently in relation to war and peace (Patchen 1965).

In all these areas sociologists can make contributions now, based on previous research. There are other areas in crying need of new sociological research, in which sociologists could contribute to a post-weapons-freeze international policy. That issue will be addressed shortly. First, two other phenomena need to be addressed: the development of the field of military sociology and the formation and precarious state of the ASA Section on the Sociology of World Conflicts.

#### Sociology of the Military

The sociological study of military institutions is, in a sense, the direct inheritor of the macrohistorical tradition of the study of society as a total world system, because the study of war was an important part of that macrohistorical tradition (Millett 1974). By the time of World War II, the study of the military was no longer in the larger context of the role of war in human affairs, but in the nationalist context of the need to enhance combat effectiveness. A growing awareness of the armed forces as a microworld with a problematic relationship to civil society kept military sociology from becoming too atheoretical.

The research agenda of this subfield fit nicely into the major disciplinary concerns of the profession: the behavior of military primary groups, and the enhancement of morale and combat effectiveness at the primary group level, brought military sociology into the field of minority group relations; soldiering as a career brought in the sociology of occupations; the demographics of the armed forces fit nicely into population studies; a focus on civil-military relations in industrialized countries and in the third world has led to valuable contributions to development theory (Lang 1972, Janowitz and Little 1965, van Doorn 1968, and Williams 1973). One approach to the study of civil-military relations which has been important for conflict and peace studies is the study of UN peacekeeping forces, notably Moskos (1976). The sociological study of war itself "has waned or has been pirated by other academic experts in 'conflict resolution' and 'peace research'" (Williams, reported by Millett 1974). In general, empirical research and comparative cross-national studies have flowered in the study of the military as a social institution.

Because war itself, and strategic policy issues regarding deterrence, nuclear capability, and arms control have not been seen as part of the agenda of military sociology (Janowitz 1971) the contributions of this subdiscipline to the nuclear debate have been modest. This is the more strange since the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society has two features which offer a potential capability to deal with national security policies both at the national and international level: (1) they have overcome the sociologist's resistance to interdisciplinary work, and are one of the most effective sociologically-oriented interdisciplinary

research associations to be found anywhere, and (2) they form the core of the Research Committee on the Armed Forces and Conflict Resolution of the International Sociological Association, and have one of the most active and internationally representative research groups to be found in the social sciences, providing a unique transnational perspective which is apparently not yet made full use of.<sup>12</sup>

The fact that the Armed Forces and Society group has added conflict resolution to its title in the ASA, and that the masthead of the Journal, Armed Forces and Society, bears the subtitle: "An Interdisciplinary Journal on Military Institutions, Civil-Military Relations, Arms Control and Peacekeeping and Conflict Management," suggests that this dynamic but cautious group may gradually move toward a broader agenda and find more overlapping interests with the World Conflicts Section of the ASA.

#### The Sociology of World Conflicts

The ASA Council established an ad hoc committee on the sociology of world conflicts in 1972 as a way of dealing with repeated requests at annual business meetings for "doing something about Vietnam." Instead of being confined to one-shot political statements about the war at annual meetings, sociologists would now be able to think out what the contributions of the profession could be to the twin problems of superpower confrontation fueled by an arms race, and the recurrence of Vietnam-type interventions in the third world. The Committee drew up a plan of work involving the preparation of a bibliography which eventuated in the World Conflicts Bibliography jointly prepared with the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development (Boulding et al. 1979), a curriculum compendium for those teaching or wishing to teach

courses in the world conflicts field, a Handbook with articles laying out the field, and the preparation of a petition to Council for a Section on the Sociology of World Conflicts. The Bibliography exists, curricula are available through the Section on Teaching, a handbook project is in process, and for the record there is the Committee's jointly prepared article on Teaching the Sociology of World Conflicts (Boulding, Elder, Goertzel, Jacobs, and Kriesberg 1974). There is also a Section. Unexpectedly, the hardest task has simply been maintaining the Section at the minimum required membership level. Why?

One answer might be that the same reasons that keep sociologists doing war/peace research marginal to the profession keeps the section itself marginal: fear of loss of objectivity, of dealing with unfamiliar variables, of messy subject matter, of contamination of the discipline by interdisciplinary activities, of being embarrassed by "human purposes." When the sociologists purposes coincide with stated national goals it is called policy research. When the sociologist's purpose is to help redefine national goals and strategies, then it is called subjectivity, and poor research. Do Section members do poor research? It happens that the Section's membership roster includes a significant number of the leading sociologists in the profession, so they clearly don't think so.

Perhaps the Section's purposes are too broad. Because so many sociologists in the conflict field have worked at the national and local level, the Section deliberately set out to make room for the necessary interconnections between local, national, and international which the global system-oriented sociologists of the first half of the twentieth century emphasized so much.<sup>13</sup> The statement of purpose reads:

To foster the development and application of sociological theories and methods for the understanding and study of those conflicts which are wide enough in scope, and involve a large enough number of participants, to be regarded as a property of the sociosphere, or the total world social system. Conflict relationships between collectivities such as countries, ethnic groups, political movements, religious groups and other social entities are included. These relationships may involve or be independent of national boundaries. While the focus is on conflicts on a scale that produces differences in social patterning, local conflicts also become a focus of study when they can be conceptualized in relation to the global system. Non-conflicting relations are also considered, insofar as they affect the awareness of conflicts, the manner in which they are conducted, and the nature of the conflicts' outcomes.

There is nothing about the nuclear debate in the Section's statement of purpose. Perhaps there should have been. Vietnam was more on people's minds at the time, and how local and international conflicts intersect. The Section has, however, played an important role in developing the study of international conflict as a field, and in contributing new courses in conflict and peace both to sociology departments around the country and to interdisciplinary peace studies programs. A recent (1982-3) survey of Section members indicated that

they give greater priority to research and "activism" (including professional contacts nationally and internationally) than to teaching in the world conflicts field (see Table 3).

In the teaching area, about half the courses focus on the nature of war and conflict in the international system, with nation states as primary actors. The second major group focuses on integrative systems and emerging global networks involving nonstate actors, and includes attention to nonviolent conflict resolution. Problems of third world development and modernization conflicts comprise the third group of courses.

Research agendas, as reflected in the Section meetings, include: dispute settlement bodies and communicative dimensions of conflict; theory and measurement of conflict processes; world peace movements; world military forces; world conflict mapping; the impact of militarism on the international social structure and social development. As can be seen, arms control and nuclear issues are missing both from the teaching and the research agendas.

The activist component of Section activity includes member involvement in the International Conflict and Cooperation Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, in research committees of the International Sociological Association; it also includes membership in the Social Scientists Against Nuclear War, the National Peace Academy Campaign, the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development, the International Peace Research Association, the Union of Concerned Scientists and the Academic Task Force for the National Freeze Campaign. Each of these organizations has a research and an education component in which sociologists presumably participate. The Section does not have a

TABLE 3\*

Activities Regarding International Interaction,  
World Conflict/Conflict Regulation

|                                 | Teaching | Research | Activism |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
|                                 | %        | %        | %        |
| The Major Part                  | 23       | 40       | 47       |
| A Secondary Part                | 32       | 23       | 20       |
| A Small Part                    | 26       | 30       | 10       |
| No Part                         | 10       | 3        | 10       |
| Inapplicable (no such activity) | 10       | 3        | 13       |
|                                 | 101      | 99       | 100      |
|                                 | (31)     | (30)     | (30)     |

\*From the Newsletter of the Section on Sociology of World Conflicts, Winter 1982-83. The 30 Section members who responded are presumably the most involved.

distinctive educational or outreach program of its own. It is not clear how involved Section members are in Washington-based legislative work, advisory roles on the Hill, or in active lobbying.

One important aspect of Section members' activity is in the UN. Jo Elder, one of the founders of the Section, served for some years as chair of the Social Science Committee of the U.S. National Committee for UNESCO, and has transmitted members' concerns on peace-related agendas to that Committee. Several members have served over the years as consultants to UNESCO's Peace and Human Rights Division, and contributed to UNESCO publications in that Division; some have also served as consultants to the UN University's Global Conflicts research program. There has been active contact in the past with UNITAR, and there will be increasing contact in the future with the UN's newest research institute, UNIDIR (the UN Institute for Disarmament Research) in Geneva. Finally, the Section will be considering a project on international conflict resolution processes for the UN International Year of Peace in 1986, which Louis Kriesberg will explain further at this panel.

In short, Section members are involved in a variety of research, development, and education activities of great importance in the long run, but with only modest visibility in the short run.

#### Where We Are, and Where We Could Go

We have traced the developments in sociology in relation to war-peace issues from World War II to the present, in the context of the developing awareness of the threat of nuclear war in the scientific community, and the mobilization of one group of scientists after

another to deal with that threat. It has been pointed out that deterrence issues cover such a narrow band of the sociologists' expertise in conflict processes that relatively little sociological attention has been given to deterrence itself, and more to the other types of interaction on the conflict-accommodation-integration continuum. The contributions of sociologists to the nuclear debate have been more indirect than direct, and focussed on alternatives to war rather than on improved coercive strategies or arms control per se. This has compounded their invisibility in public debate on nuclear issues. The macroanalysis of the world as a total system recommended by sociologists at the close of World War II is only now coming into its own. In general, statist frames of reference still prevail. The marginality of world conflict studies to the profession, in spite of the prestige of the sociologists who carry them out, has been noted. Account has been taken of the development of the field of military sociology, which does not deal with strategy issues, and of the Section on World Conflicts, which is increasing the policy relevance of its research at the international level.

In summary, the contributions of sociologists have not been insignificant, but neither has the profession lived up to its potential in dealing with the major threat to the survival of the human race. As my contribution to the realization of that potential, I am adding an appendix to this paper listing major research areas where sociologists, because of the work they have already accomplished in other contexts, could make a significant impact both on policy thinking and public opinion. On the one hand we need a deeper understanding of the world military system, of the war symbolism in our culture, of the dangers of military decision making under stress, and of the

sociological dimensions of the nuclear winter. This can tell us what to move away from. On the other hand, we need analyses of the changing ratio of military to diplomatic capabilities, of noncoercive international interaction sequences, of best-case scenarios for the future. This can tell us what we can move toward. I agree with George Lundberg that we sociologists do have at least some of the knowledge needed for peace. I also know as a futurist that only to the extent that we can visualize a future society in which some significant peacemaking has been achieved, can we use our capabilities meaningfully in the present. At a time when people are worrying about next steps after the nuclear freeze, sociologists could do no better than come up with some best-case scenarios for the rest of the century.

APPENDIX:

A Research Agenda for Sociologists Relating to the Threat of Nuclear War

1. World Military System

- A. Study the world military system, including all countries and all alliances, as a single interdependent system. (Points of departure: Wallerstein's world systems analysis (197 ); International Peace Research Association proposal for study of global militarization to the UN Second Special Session on Disarmament, 1982.)
- B. Expand the concept of the military-industrial complex to include each participating sector which supports and benefits from continued military development: education, science, transport, and communication sectors, etc. Analyze the interdependence between sectors (C. Wright Mills 1956, Moskos 1974).
- C. Study the shift of decision making on national security issues from the civilian to the military sector along the lines suggested by Myrdal (1976) and O'Connell (1983).

2. War Symbolism in Culture

- A. Study the pervasiveness of military symbolism in everyday language, art, literature, advertising, the mass media, religion. See Forsberg, "the failure . . . of plans for disarmament . . . rests not in a faulty conceptual analysis of the nature of war, but in a failure to appreciate the depth of the remaining cultural acceptance of war" (1984:309). See O'Connell's analysis of the cultural preferences of the military for types of weaponry (1983).

- B. Use symbolic interactionist analysis to uncover mental imagery associated with defense policy debates (Goffman-style, not Hall 1972).
- C. Analyze bellism as sexism and racism have been analyzed.
- D. Expand the concept of human rights to the right to be free of nuclear weapons, the right to nuclear-free zones, the right to live in a peaceful international order (Asbjørn Eide and Marek Thee, 1983).

### 3. Trend Analyses

- A. Resource allocation to the civilian versus the military sector over time (Goertzel 1984).
- B. Security policy planning over time (expansion of analysis begun by Kegley and Holcomb, 1976).
- C. Develop measures of diplomatic capability to match existing measures of military capability, and do a trend analysis of the changing ratio of diplomatic to military capability as a contribution to the assessment of national security over time. (Hypothesis: the lower the military capability is in relation to the diplomatic capability, the greater the national security.) Use Kegley and Holcomb (1976) data as one input, also E. Boulding's measures of transnational capability (1975).

### 4. Deterrence

- A. Carry Horowitz's (1970) analysis of deterrence further.
- B. Develop sociological risk-perception analysis to match psychological analysis (Fischhoff) and apply to disarmament scenarios.
- C. Expand on mirror-image analysis of coercive bargaining (Gamson 1971; )

5. Decision Making Under Stress

- A. Explore the kinds of decision making stress which Frei (1982), in his study of the risks of unintentional war, gives as most probable causes of unintentional war, as opposed to technological failures; case studies and small-group experiments here.
- B. Analyze and compare the practice of worst-case scenarios and best-case scenarios for policy planning during crises. Which practice gives the most problem solving options? Case studies and small-group experiments here (E. Boulding 1982, Moore, 1966).
- C. Develop a model of a peace-opportunity information service in the State Department to parallel the threat information services provided by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency.

6. Sociological Nuclear Winter Studies

- A. Analyze the destruction of interpersonal relations and the destruction of social infrastructure that would accompany nuclear destruction. Extrapolate from holocaust studies, Hiroshima studies, nuclear winter studies, U.S. disaster studies; use data from nuclear war impact assessments, but focus on the interpersonal and the social, rather than the physical, impacts (Erickson ( ), Dynes ( ), Rossi ( ), Drabek ( ), and others).

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Economists, like sociologists, formed no special professional group on war and peace. However, the visibility of individual economists publishing on the economics of war and conversion and peace was so high (for example, Kenneth Boulding and Emile Benoit) that economics was seen as a relevant discipline by the general public even in the absence of a special professional mobilization.
2. The Technical Problems of Arms Control, Feld, Brennan, et al.; Decision-Making in National and International Political Processes, Richard Snyder and James Robinson; Attitude Formation, Including Processes and Media of Communication, Ithiel de Sola Poole; Economic Factors Bearing Upon the Maintenance of Peace, Kenneth Boulding et al.; and Development of World Rule of Law for the Prevention of War, Arthur Larson.
3. Most of these associations also had a similar committee at the level of their international associational counterpart. The economists were the exception. They had no committee in the American Economic Association but did have one for the International Economic Association.
4. Robert Park's Social Functions of War, published in the American Journal of Sociology that same year, has received much less attention.
5. Ogburn's own study, American Society in Wartime (1944), I have not been able to find and cannot comment on.
6. On this point about the future creating the present, see also Wendell Bell (1966) and Fred Polak (1962). Polak is a Dutch sociologist who works in the macrohistorical tradition.
7. My asterisks indicating sociological attention represent a judgement based on scanning the American Sociological Review from 1941, the American Journal of Sociology, the Journal of Armed Forces and Society from its inception in 1974, and selected issues of Sociological Inquiry.
8. For further discussion of the responsibilities of scientists, see Raimo Vayrynen, 1976.
9. Protest against the use of university facilities for military research in the physical sciences has a much longer history and continues to polarize both the scientific community and the public.
10. Etzioni's subsequent book, The Hard Way to Peace, attempts to reconcile strategic deterrence with his understanding of social process. This is an example of the statist frame of reference overcoming sociological insight.

11. James Laue, who is now director of the Harvard Conflict Clinic at the University of Missouri, served as Vice Chair of the Commission. Elise Boulding also served as Commissioner.
12. Charles Moskos is currently serving as President of the Research Committee and is well aware of its uniqueness as a collaborative body dealing with sensitive issues of national security. It is to be hoped that some pioneering international research on security will come from this group.
13. It happens that the Section on World Systems was being established at the same time, and there was discussion on merging the two initiatives. The major obstacle to such a merging is a special commitment on the part of the World Conflicts Section members to a commitment to concentrating on war as a social problem.

While the world systems frame of reference is shared, the research focus is different. Efforts to change the name of the Section to something like War-Peace Studies to give more emphasis to what is in an operational sense our focus always end with a resounding affirmation of our present title. The truth is that we are a home to a very diverse group of researchers who nevertheless need each other, and want research interaction and collegial support from one another.

## REFERENCES

- Angell, Robert C.  
1951 "Sociology and the World Crisis," American Sociological Review 16:6, pp. 749-756.
- Archibald, Kathleen  
1963 "Social Science Approaches to Peace," Social Problems XI:98.
- Aron, Raymond  
1965 The Great Debate: Theories of Nuclear Strategy. New York: Doubleday.  
1958 On War: Atomic Weapons and Global Diplomacy. London: Decker and Warburg.
- Azar, Edward and Joseph Ben-Dak  
1975 Theory and Practise of Events Analysis. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- Barbera, Henry  
1973 Rich Nations and Poor in Peace and War: Continuity and Change in the Development Hierarchy of Seventy Nations From 1913 Through 1952. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.  
1984 "The Conditions of Peace," paper given at the 79th annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- Bartos, Otomar  
1974 Process and Outcome of Negotiations. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bell, Wendell  
1968 "The Future as the Cause of the Present." Address to the 1966 American Sociological Association.
- Ben-Dak, Joseph  
1974 The Future of Collective Violence: Societal and International Perspectives. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.
- Bernard, Jessie  
1950 "Where is the Modern Sociology of Conflict?" American Journal of Sociology LVI: 1, pp. 11-16.  
1951  
1965 "Some Current Conceptualizations in the Field of Conflict," American Journal of Sociology LXX:4, pp. 442-454.
- Boulding, Elise, with Robert Passmore and Robert Scott Gassler  
1979 Bibliography on World Conflict and Peace. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

- Boulding, Elise  
1975 "The Measurement of Cultural Potentials for Transnationalism,"  
Journal of Peace Research, 11:3, pp. 189-202.  
1983 "The Social Imagination and Crisis of Human Futures," Forum  
for Correspondence and Contact, 13:2, February.
- Boulding, Elise and Kenneth  
1969 "The Homogeneity of International Studies," SHC/Conf. 13/4  
(July), paper given at advisory meeting of Experts on UNESCO's  
Role in Developing Research on Peace Problems.
- Boulding, Elise, and Joseph Elder, Ted Goertzel, Ruth Jacobs, Louis Kriesberg  
1974 "Teaching the Sociology of World Conflicts: a Review of the  
State of the Field," American Sociologist, 9 (November), pp.  
187-193.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie  
1961 "The Mirror-Image in Soviet-American Relations:" A Social  
Psychologist's Report." Journal of Social Issues, 17, 3 (1961),  
pp. 45-50.
- Bruyn, Severyn and Paula Raymon, eds.  
1978 Creative Conflict in Society: Nonviolent Theory and Action.  
New York: Wiley.
- Callis, Helmut  
1947 "The Sociology of International Relations," American Sociological  
Review, 12:3, pp. 323-334.
- Caplow, Theodore  
1968 Two Against One: Coalitions in Triads. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:  
Prentice-Hall.
- Coleman, James  
1957 Community Conflict. New York: Free Press.
- Commision on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict  
Resolution  
1981 To Establish the United States Academy of Peace. Washington,  
D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Coser, Lewis  
1956 The Function of Social Conflict. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Crawford, Elizabeth and Albert Biderman, eds.  
1969 Social Scientists and International Affairs. New York: Wiley.
- Crews, Robin  
1984 Social Values, the Scientific Pursuit of Knowledge and Weapons  
in process Research, doctoral dissertation in progress, Sociology Department,  
University of Colorado at Boulder.

Dahrendorf, Ralph

- 1967 Conflict After Class: New Perspectives on the Theory of Social and Political Conflict. London: Longmans.

Dentler, Robert and Phillips Culright

- 1963 Hostage America: Human Aspects of a Nuclear Attack and a Program of Prevention. Boston: Beacon Press.

Eide, Asbjørn and Marek Thee

- 1983 Human Rights and the International Order.

Etzioni, Amitai

- 1962 The Hard Way to Peace. New York: Collier.  
1961 "Our First Manual of Nuclear War," Columbia Forum, IV:4.  
1965 Political Verification. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Evan, William, with Quincy Wright and Morton Deutsch

- 1962 Preventing World War III. New York: Simon and Schuster.  
1984 The Role of International Scientific Associations in the Global System, study in process at the University of Pennsylvania.

Fein, Helen

- 1979 Accounting for Genocide. New York: Free Press.

Finsterbusch, Kurt

- 1973 "The Sociology of Nation States," in Armer and Grimshaw, eds., Comparative Social Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons.  
1974 "Theories of Domestic and International Conflict and Their Relationships," in Ben-Dak, ed., The Future of Collective Violence. Lund, Sweden: Student-Litteratur.  
1974 "World Systems and the Theory of National Actors," in General Systems Yearbook, 19, pp. 147-153.  
1975 "The Unprofitability of War in the Twentieth Century," with H.C. Greisman, Social Problems, 22:3, pp. 450-463.  
1982 Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Social Issues, ed. with George McKenna. Guilford, Conn.: Dushkin.

Fischhoff, Baruch

- 198 Perception of Risk of Exposure By Workers at Nuclear Plants.

Frei, Daniel, and Christian Catrina

- 1982 Risks of Unintentional Nuclear War. Geneva: United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

Forsberg, Randy

- 1984 "The freeze and Beyond," World Policy Journal, 1:2, pp. 285-318.

Galtung, Johan

- 1969 "Violence, Peace and Peace Research," Journal of Peace Research, 6:3, pp. 67-92.

- Gamson, William A. and Andre Modigliani  
1971 Untangling the Cold War, A Strategy for Testing Rival Theories.  
Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Gamson, William A. with Bruce Fineman and Steven Rytina  
1982 Encounters With Unjust Authority. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- Gamson, William A.  
1968 Power and Discontent. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter  
1982 "National Security Trial," International Peace Research  
Newsletter, XX:3, pp. 19-23.
- Goode, William  
1970 "The Place of Force in Human Society," American Sociological  
Review, 37:1, pp. 507-519.
- Goertzel, Ted  
1984 "Militarism as a Sociological Problem," in Research in  
Political Sociology, Richard Braungart and Philo Washbrom,  
eds. Connecticut: JAI Press.
- Green, Philip  
1966 Deadly Logic: The Theory of Nuclear Deterrence. Columbus:  
Ohio State U. Press.
- Grimshaw, Allen  
1969 Racial Violence in the U.S. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gross, Lewellyn  
1959 Symposium in Sociological Theory. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gurvitch, Georges  
1950 "A Sociological Analysis of International Tensions," in Hadley  
Cantril, ed., Tensions That Cause Wars. Urbana, Ill.:  
University of Illinois Press.
- Hall, Peter M.  
1972 "A Symbolic Interactionist Analysis of Politics," Sociological  
Inquiry, 42:3-4, pp. 35-76.
- Hamilton, Larry  
1980 "Political Kidnapping as a Deadly Game," Simulation and Games,  
11:4.  
1978 "Conflict Variables in World Simulations," Futures: April.
- Hart, Hormell  
1949 "The Pre-War Upsurge in Social Science," American Sociological  
Review, 14:5, pp. 599-607.  
1946 "Technological Acceleration and the Atomic Bomb," American  
Sociological Review, 11:3, pp. 277-291.

- Horowitz, Irving Louis  
1979 Constructing Policy. New York: Praeger.  
1976 Genocide: State Power and Mass Murder. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.  
1957 War and Peace in Contemporary Social and Philosophical Theory.  
and 1973 London: Souvenir Press (Educational and Academic) Ltd.  
1967 The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.  
1970 "Deterrence Games: From Academic Casebook to Military Guidebook," in The Structure of Conflict, Paul Swingle, ed. New York: Academic Press, pp. 277-296.
- International Peace Research Association Newsletter  
1975 "Scholars, Knowledge, and the Public: A Pledge," XII:122, pp. 39-46.
- Janowitz, Morris and Roger Little  
1965 Sociology and the Military Establishment. New York: Russell Sage.
- Janowitz, Morris  
1971 "Sociological Research on Arms Control," American Sociologist, VI: June, pp. 23-30.  
1982 "Consequences of Social Science Research on the U.S. Military," Armed Forces and Society, 8:4, pp. 507-524.
- Journal of Social Issues  
1961 Psychology and Policy in a Nuclear Age, Roger Russell, ed., XVII:3.
- Kegley, Charles and Pamela Holcomb  
1976 "U.S. National Security Policy 1950-1973," Armed Forces and Society, 2:4, pp. 573-594.
- Knoll, Erwin and Judith Nies McFadden  
1969 American Militarism 1970. New York: Viking Press. 1969 Senate-House 2-day Conference on "Military Budget and National Priorities."
- Kriesberg, Louis  
1973 Sociology of Social Conflicts. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.  
1968 Social Processes in International Relations. New York: Wiley.  
1972 "International Nongovernmental Organizations and Transnational Integration," International Association, 11 (November), pp. 520-525.  
1974 "International Decision Making," in Michael Haas, et al., International Systems: A Behavioral Approach. New York: Chandler.
- Lang, Kurt  
1972 Military Institutions and the Sociology of War. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

- Lasswell, Harold D.  
1941 "The Garrison State," *American Journal of Sociology*, 46:41, pp. 455-466.
- Lifton, Robert  
1967 *Death in Life: Survivors of Hiroshima*. New York: Random House.
- Millett, Allan  
1974 "Arms Control and Research on Military Institutions," *Armed Forces and Society*, 1:1, pp. 61-77.
- Mills, C. Wright  
1957 *The Causes of World War III*. New York: Simon and Schuster.  
1956 *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moore, Wilbert  
1966 "Global Sociology: The World as a Singular System," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXXI:5, pp. 475-482.  
1966 "The Utility of Utopias," *American Sociological Review*, 31:6, pp. 765-772.
- Moskos, Charles  
1974 "The Concept of the Military-Industrial Complex," *Social Problems*, 21:4, 498-512.  
1976 *Peace Soldiers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Myrdal, Alva  
1976 *The Game of Disarmament*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Ogburn, William F.  
1944 *American Society in Wartime*. New York: reprinted by De Capo Printing, 1972.
- O'Connell, Robert  
1983 "Putting Weapons in Perspective," *Armed Forces and Society*, 9:3, pp. 441-454.
- Osgood, Charles  
1962 *An Alternative to War or Surrender*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Patchen, Martin  
1965 "Decision Theory in the Study of National Action," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 9:2, pp. 146-176.  
1970 "Models of Cooperation and Conflict," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 14:3.
- Peck, Sidney  
1980 "The Problems of Nuclear Weapons in Late Capitalism and Early Socialism," paper presented at World Conflicts Section, American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, 1980.

- Pilisuk, Mark  
1972 International Conflict and Social Policy. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Polak, Fred  
1961 The Image of the Future, translated by E. Boulding. New York: Oceana Press. 2 vols. Abr. E. Boulding, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Elsevier, 1972.
- Rodberg, Leonard and Derek Shearer  
1970 The Pentagon Watchers; Students Report on the National Security State. New York: Doubleday & Co. Anchor Book.
- Schevitz, Jeffrey  
1970 "The Militarized Society and the Weapons Maker," Sociological Inquiry, 40:1, pp. 49-57.
- Scribner, Richard, William Metz, and Theodore Ralston  
1984 Verification and Arms Control: A Primer on Technology and the Process of Verification. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A.  
1966 "Comments on Moore's and Bierstedt's Papers," American Journal of Sociology, LXXI:5, pp. 491-492.  
1965 "Sociology of Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow," American Sociological Review, 30:6.  
1937-41 Social and Cultural Dynamics, 4 Vols. New York: American Book Co.  
1944 "The Conditions and Prospects for a World Without War," American Journal of Sociology, 49:5, pp. 441-449.
- Tobias, Sheila and Peter Goudinoff, Stefan Leader, Shelah Leader  
1982 What Kinds of Guns Are They Buying For Your Butter? A Beginner's Guide to Defense, Weaponry, and Military Spending. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- Vayrynen, Raimo  
1976 "Responsibility of Scientists Revisited," International Peace Research Association Newsletter, XIV: 2, 2-7.
- Swingle, Paul  
1970 The Structure of Conflict. New York: Academic Press.
- van Doorn, Jacques  
1968 Armed Forces and Society. The Hague: Mouton.
- Walters, E.V.  
1969 Terror and Resistance: Study of Political Violence. New York: Oxford University Press.  
1964 "Violence and the Process of Terror," American Sociological Review, 29:1, pp. 248-257.

- Wehr, Paul  
1978 Conflict Regulation. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- White, Ralph K.  
1966 "Misperception and the Vietnam War," Journal of Social Issues, XXII:3.
- Wiberg, Hakan  
1982 "Courts and Secrecy," International Peace Research Newsletter, XX:3, pp. 24-25.
- White, Gilbert  
1984 "Notes on Geographers and the Threat of Nuclear War," Transition, 14:1, pp. 2-4.
- Williams, Robin  
1973 "Continuity and Change in Recent Research on Social Institutions," Annals, CCXCVI, pp. 171-182.
- Znaniecki, Florian  
1951 "European and American Sociology After Two World Wars," American Journal of Sociology, LVI:3, pp. 217-221.